

Muhammad Asadi Humanistic Concerns Part 4

Those who study Islam and its history, easily recognize that the sources used as “evidence” by these self proclaimed “humanists”, like the Hadith (sayings attributed to the prophet), collected by Bokhari (d. 870 AD) and Muslim (d. 875 AD), and other pseudo-historical collections of the life of the prophet (based on secondary sources, quoted by other secondary sources, e.g. the work of Ibn Ishaq (d.768 AD) survives only in quotations in Tabari (d. 923 AD) and Ibn Hisham (d. 834 AD) and there also, many versions of the events are given), date from around 200 years after the prophet (d. 632 AD). Those who study Islam based upon historical evidence, reason and reflection (recommended by the Quran itself), would reject these extra-Quranic sources immediately (see <http://hadith.rationalreality.com>). Just because many believe in them dogmatically does not mean that the prophet said those words or that those words are what Islam is. Islam is defined by its source, which is the Quran and the Quran alone.

Ibn Khaldun, the founder of Sociology, and historiography recognized the shortcomings in the accuracy of these pseudo-historical reports regarding Islam and the prophet, and he quoted the Quran defending his position, even as he developed historiography in his Muqaddimah. That Ibn-Khaldun was a better authority on historical records than the ideologically charged “hadith collectors” is something most historians will not argue over, given the unique position he occupies in the evolution of their field. The verse Ibn-Khaldun quoted is the same that Muslims quote today when informing dogmatic traditionalists that these “extra Quranic” (from outside the Quran) reports are not always accurate (Quran 31:6): “And among humankind are those that purchase frivolous tales (Lahwal Hadith), so that they may mislead from the path of Allah (those) without knowledge, and to make them an excuse to ridicule with.”

Now, here this Muslim denies the very history of Islam because it shows his prophet was a criminal. Can this Muslim tell us what happened to the real history of Islam and why all these devout followers of Muhammad who were so brainwashed that they were ready to die for him, instead of reporting the true story of him portrayed him, their own prophet, as an ogre? This argument is counterintuitive and quite unintelligent. It makes absolutely no sense that all the followers of Muhammad confabulated with each other to fabricate false stories about their prophet making him look like a criminal.

We can perfectly understand why believers lie to attribute false miracles to their prophet and make him look holy. One good example of that is the story of Muhammad being abused by a Jewess who every day used to throw garbage at him and one day, when he did not see her, he enquired about her and found out that she is ill. Then he paid her a visit and showed her kindness. This story was first claimed by the Baha'is and is attributed to their prophet Abdul' Baha, who was exiled with his father to Akka and was ill treated by the Arab inhabitants of

that town. Muslims, shamelessly have plagiarized this story and have attributed it to their savage prophet who ordered a Jewess, a mother of five small children, to be assassinated only because she had composed a poetry against him. This story is all over the Internet and I must have been sent over ten times by ignorant Muslims who want to make me believe this fiend was a holy man.. It cannot be found in any early source and yet no one tries to stop it because it is an expedient lie. This is how good tales about Muhammad were concocted and included in the early hadiths.

We can understand why Muslims lie to make their prophet look saintly. But how can we explain the claim that they all lied, and incidentally all of them fabricated similar lies, to make the one whom they loved more than their own lives and their own parents look like a monster? Only a Muslim is capable of believing in such an absurdity.

The verse 31:6 has nothing to do with the history of Muhammad or the stories collected by Bukhari and Muslim about him. Muhammad did not say that the stories about his own life are frivolous tales. At the time he wrote that verse, the stories about him did not even exist. In this verse Muhammad is exhorting his followers not to listen to the frivolous tales of other storytellers who were competing with him and instead listen to him because as he claimed, his stories were revelations from Allah.

Muhammad claimed to have "*sublime morals*" (68:4) and be "*a good example to follow*" (33:21). How can Muslims follow his examples if those examples are not recorded? Denying the hadith make it impossible for Muslims to practice Islam properly or follow the examples of Muhammad and therefore the quranic injunction stated above cannot be observed. In fact without the hadith, none of the rituals of Islam, such as salat, hajj and fasting can be performed and these are the pillars of Islam. Without the hadith and Sira the very historicity of Muhammad becomes dubious. How can you prove that the Quran is not written by a bunch of Arab rulers as a manifesto for their imperialistic ambition?

This Muslim often says Muhammad cannot be incriminated in any court of law based on hadiths because their authenticity cannot be proven. What about the authenticity of the Quran? Can anyone prove the authenticity of the Quran? What is good for the goose is also good for the gander. How do we know that Muhammad did not lie? How do we know the entity that he claimed visited him was not Satan pretending to be Gabriel? How could he know the difference if he never met Gabriel? If Muhammad admitted that he was fooled once by Satan, how do we know he was not fooled more often? If Satan is the master of deceptions, how can we be sure that Islam is not a trick of Satan? The Quran looks pretty satanic and Muhammad's examples were demonic. How do we know the Quran that we have today is the original one? Who collected it? Was this person(s) trustworthy? How can we be sure that it is preserved without alteration? If it was possible for the Jews and the Christians to corrupt their books, hundreds of years after they were written, as Muhammad has claimed, to erase his name, how can we be sure that Muslims did not do the same with the Quran only a few years after his death? At that time no copy of the Quran even existed, so although the accusation of Muhammad that the Bible is corrupted is farfetched, it is not illogical to believe that the Quran was corrupted even before it was collected and put into a

single binder. Can anyone prove the authenticity of the Quran in a court of law? See how easily Muslims fall in the same traps that they set? All you have to do to demolish their argument is take it and use it against themselves.

The fact that some Muslims are ashamed of what Muhammad did, does not make those stories invalid. Muslims should be ashamed for following such a thug and Mr. Asadi should be ashamed for thinking that by denying the hadith and the Sira that report Muhammad's crimes he can acquit that fiend.

The misuse of such 'historical' sourcing by these post 9/11 'lynch-mob mentality' supporters, forms a major chunk of their arguments against Islam, even as they use these tales as "an excuse to ridicule with", just as stated by the Quran (above). Similar arguments have been used for hundreds of years to debunk Islam, but these authors claim to have invented them anew.

Who said we have invented anything new? From the Quran we learn that the same logical arguments were raised by the thinking people of Mecca. Muhammad never answered them except insulting his critics with *ad hominem*, - calling them deaf, dumb, blind - or *ad baculum* - threatening them with hellfire. These are logical fallacies. The difference is that now technology makes it possible to raise these old questions and make the world see the stupidity of Islam. There is nowhere Muslims can hide now. Pray to Allah and let us see if he can send you a raven, or even a mole, to teach you how to hide this shame.

Most of the rest of what they present amounts to Ad Hominem attacks against the prophet and clippings from the Quran, bits and pieces of verses clipped not only out of their context but out of their sentence as well. The clipped verses are then presented with their long (pages worth of) interpretations, associating them with groups like the Taliban (as if the Taliban were the "word made flesh"), or photographs that are supposed to elicit stereotypical responses from a fearful public.

Again this Muslim repeats the same thing he stated at the beginning of his essay. He clearly does not understand the meaning of *ad hominem*. Criticizing Muhammad is not *ad hominem*. He is the subject of the discussion.

If you accuse me of theft and you have some evidence, that is not ad hominem. That is a charge that could be true or false and it is up to me to prove you wrong or I am guilty as charged. But if instead of refuting your evidences I start attacking you, saying you are a wife beater, a drunkard, and a thief yourself, that would be ad hominem. You could be all those things, but they have nothing to do with the charge you have made against me. If you have presented evidence against me, I have to prove my innocent. If instead of defending myself I start attacking you, that is ad hominem. .

Ad hominem is what this Muslim did all along in this article. Instead of defending Islam he kept attacking the critics of Islam. This is *ad hominem*. He does not understand this. He is a Muslim after all and what can you expect from a Muslim.

Now, instead of wasting time trying to dupe people, spending countless hours and tons of paper doing so while over 40,000 human beings die every day due to preventable causes in the world (like starvation and disease), these self-proclaimed "humanitarians" would do better to look at the socio-economic, political and military links that produce this misery in a world system dominated by the US power elite (<http://elite.asadi.org>) and not the "phantoms" that they have constructed: phantoms that become fear generating marketing tools that feed the militarized political economy dominated by the U.S. power elite.

There we go again. The Muslim keeps throwing at us red herrings to distract us from the subject. Doesn't this show that the poor Muslim has run out of arguments to defend his stupid faith?

Furthermore, it is Islam that brings misery and war to this world and once Islam is removed the condition of these poor people who are mostly victims of Islam will also improve and most of those 40,000 lives will be saved. Just look at Iran. 70 million people live in hell. It is all because of Islam. The same can be said about Pakistan or any other Islamic country where people go from bad to worse every year. We have to eliminate the root of the problem. Islam is the root of most human problems.

I hope you had a good look into the hopeless mind of a Muslim and a scholar to boot. This is how the brain of a Muslim works (or rather doesn't). Did anyone see any sign of intelligence in this Muslim? A mind that is on Islam is like a mind on drugs. Indeed Islam is the opium of the masses and here you saw it with your own eyes.